



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,323	12/28/1999	RAMESH MAINI	21964-P002US	9848

7590 08/04/2003

ROBERT C SHADDOX
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK PC
SUITE 2400
910 TRAVIS
HOUSTON, TX 770025895

EXAMINER

LAGMAN, FREDERICK LYNDON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/473,323

Applicant(s)

MAINI ET AL.

Examiner

Fredrick L. Lagman

Art Unit

3673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 42-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7,9,10,12,14,15,17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6,8,11,13,16,18 and 21-41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawagoe et al #4,735,526. Kawagoe et al discloses a jack-up platform 10 comprising legs 12 raised and lowered by a jacking system; mooring lines 38 radially spaced in plan on extremities of the hull; anchors 39 that are radially spaced and attached to the mooring lines; and tensioning system 37 for providing tension in the mooring lines 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, 5, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Petty et al #5,061,131.

As to claims 4 and 5, Kawagoe et al discloses the claimed invention except for the single mooring line extending at equal angles or multiple lines extending in sets. Petty et al teaches that it is known to provide multiple lines 18 extending in sets as

shown in figure 1. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple lines extending in sets, as taught by Petty et al in order to facilitate stabilization of an offshore rig. Kawagoe et al shows a platform moored adjacent a preinstalled gravity structure; however if Kawagoe et al was not adjacent such structure it would have been obvious matter of design choice to have a single line extending at equal angles from the hull extremities, since doing so would facilitate stabilization of the offshore platform.

As to claims 17, 19 and 20, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have mooring lines at an angle within the range of 20-40 degrees, since doing so would depend upon for example water depth or the length of mooring line. Furthermore, base on the figure drawings of Petty et al, it appears that the angle of the mooring lines is in the range of 20-40 degrees.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Westra et al #4,432,671. Kawagoe et al discloses the claimed invention except for the suction anchor. Westra et al teaches that it is known to provide suction anchors for offshore structures as set forth at column 1, lines 10-14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a suction anchor, as taught by Westra et al in order to facilitate anchoring of an offshore structure.

6. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Petty et al as applied to claims 4 and 5 above, and further in view of Westra et al #4,432,671. Kawagoe et al as modified by Petty et al discloses the

Art Unit: 3673

claimed invention except for the suction anchor. Westra et al teaches that it is known to provide suction anchors for offshore structures as set forth at column 1, lines 10-14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a suction anchor, as taught by Westra et al in order to facilitate anchoring of an offshore structure.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Schatzle, Jr. #5,498,107. Kawagoe et al discloses the claimed invention except for the mooring lines made from Kevlar. Schatzle Jr. teaches that it is known to provide mooring lines 18 made from Kevlar as set forth at columns 6-7, lines 65-08. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Kevlar, as taught by Schatzle, Jr. in order to provide a mooring line that is easier to handle and have superior tensile strength.

8. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Petty et al as applied to claims 4 and 5 above, and further in view of Schatzle, Jr. #5,498,107. Kawagoe et al as modified by Petty et al discloses the claimed invention except for the mooring lines made from Kevlar. Schatzle Jr. teaches that it is known to provide mooring lines 18 made from Kevlar as set forth at columns 6-7, lines 65-08. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Kevlar, as taught by Schatzle, Jr. in order to provide a mooring line that is easier to handle and have superior tensile strength.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 21-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

10. With respect to claim 1, applicant's arguments filed 2/16/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Kawagoe discloses a tensioning system 34, 35, 36, 37 for maintaining tension in the cables or keeping the cables taut. Applicant argues that pretensioned lines are claimed; however, this is not the case. There is no recitation of the lines being pretensioned in claim 1.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chun '709 discloses the use of pretensioned lines for a mooring system. Karsan et al '630 discloses the use of Kevlar. Chabot '453 discloses the radial spacing of multiple mooring lines.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick L. Lagman whose telephone number is 703-305-7456. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Schackelford can be reached on 703-308-2978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Application/Control Number: 09/473,323

Page 6

Art Unit: 3673

305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1134.



Frederick L. Lagman
Examiner
Art Unit 3673

FLL
July 29, 2003